

FOLLOWING FRANCIS REDFERN

BY

W. G. TORRANCE, M.A.

PART IV

**Uttoxeter in the
Early Years of the
Stuart Period**

Price 30p.

AT THE END OF PART III it was pointed out that Redfern, in his story of Uttoxeter, had passed from his account of the affairs of the Duchy of Lancaster after the Wars of the Roses rather too rapidly, to events of 1625 and later. He thus made only cursory reference to the state of the Duchy lands under the Tudor monarchs, and to the immense changes in Learning, in Religion, and in the general conditions of life of the middle class merchants and country squires throughout England.

He did record, however, that the Tudor kings took steps to prevent the Duchy keepers from malpractices, and that in 1558 when Queen Elizabeth came into possession of the Lancaster estates around Tutbury and Uttoxeter, the Uttoxeter Ward of Needwood ceased to be classed as a Royal Forest, governed by the sovereign's edicts, and became subject to the Common Laws of England. He also noted that though the deer were soon destroyed in the Uttoxeter Ward, the finest timber in Needwood was to be found there.

When King James VI of Scotland became James I of England in 1603 by right of his descent from Henry VII's daughter Margaret Tudor, who married James IV of Scotland, Englishmen found a very different type of sovereign from Elizabeth. The new king, 37 years old in 1603, had been an infant when his mother, Mary Queen of Scots, had been deposed in 1568. The child, though well-taught (one of his tutors was George Buchanan, perhaps the most learned man of his day) had endured such strict training, especially under the Presbyterian followers of John Knox, that when he was able to shake off his stern advisers, his own native obstinacy asserted itself. He clung to the notion that he was King by Divine Right, answerable only to himself; moreover, he was personally unattractive, gawky, and showed signs of homosexuality. The restricted financial conditions of Scotland led him to extravagances in his new kingdom. The comparatively weak position of Parliament in Scotland, where the democratic assemblies of the Presbyterian organisation

were more important, caused James to under-estimate the powers of the English Parliament, and to regard with suspicion the large numbers of Englishmen in all classes of society who tended to hold Puritan or even Presbyterian views. He therefore supported the Bishops against the Puritans, and liked to show how learned he himself was in religious matters. He also regarded himself as destined to bring peace to the contending nations of Western Europe, and so abandoned the anti-Spanish policy which had been maintained by English statesmen, merchants, sailors, and Parliament throughout Elizabeth's reign.

Such a ruler was bound to have trouble with most of his subjects, and he was not regarded with respect on account of his apparent indifference to his mother's fate. Though he succeeded to the Duchy of Lancaster estates in the Uttoxeter district, he seemed to have no qualms in visiting Tutbury Castle where she had been imprisoned so long, for he loved hunting in Needwood Forest. The name "King's Standing" is said to have been given to the high ground between Tutbury and Hanbury where he used to rest during a hunt. (Readers of Scott's novel "*The Fortunes of Nigel*" will find many of King James' peculiarities well portrayed, especially his extravagance and his love of the hunting of deer ; but Scott did not praise the king's horsemanship).

Englishmen were antagonised by the execution of Raleigh to appease the Spaniards ; also by James' love of favourites, especially the Duke of Buckingham. The Duke tried to arrange a marriage for Charles, Prince of Wales, with a Spanish Princess ; Buckingham was assassinated in 1628 by a fanatical opponent. English Protestants were angered by the failure of James to aid the Protestants of Europe in the Thirty Years' War ; one Protestant ruler lost all his land ; this was the most disliked in England, because he was Elector Palatine, was the husband of James' daughter Elizabeth. (Rupert and Maurice, Elizabeth's two sons, came to England to help their uncle, King Charles, in the Civil War, and Rupert visited Uttoxeter, Lichfield, and Tutbury on a number of occasions).

The Protestants of Northern Germany were eventually saved by the famous soldier-monarch King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, who lost his life at Lutzen, seven years after James I died.

James is remembered because he sponsored two important religious events in his reign ; in 1604 he called together the Hampton Court Conference ; there English Christian leaders attempted reconciliation between Episcopalians and Puritans. James made a great display of his knowledge of Theology, but his childhood and later experience of Presbyterianism led him to dread the possibility of its influence on the Government ; and to make two declarations : "No Bishop — No King" and "I shall make them (i.e. Puritans) conform, or I will harry them out of the land !" This attitude was regarded by the historian Trevelyan to have "cost the blood and tears of three generations."

James was alarmed to find that many English country clergy, noblemen, and squires, were inclined towards the Presbyterians. In the Uttoxeter district it is noteworthy that the Earl of Essex (Chartley) and Dr. John Lightfoot, son of the Vicar of Uttoxeter, held such views, though John Lightfoot did not actually leave the Church of England.

There is some evidence, recently discovered by Mr. J. W. S. Dunncliff, that some premises in Carter Street, occupied by Thomas Dudley, were already used for meetings of persons then termed "recusants". Such meetings were frowned upon by the authorities in Queen Elizabeth's reign, and those who refused to attend the Episcopal Parish Church (i.e. recusants) were fined. Probably the Dudley family (two are named in the 1629 Survey) and a relative, Edward Bott, who died before 1629, were originally Brownists, many of whom went to the Netherlands, and thence as Pilgrim Fathers to America.

The small nucleus, known as "Independents" in Cromwell's time, later increased in number after 1660. This may be the result of the demobilisation of Cromwell's army, many of whom were "Independents". A report of 1663/4 by Sir Bryan Broughton stated that in Uttoxeter 49 such ex-parliamentary soldiers were found.

There are also records of constant meetings held at Thorney Lane after 1662, and the numbers were said to have exceeded those of Uttoxeter.

We shall later give a full account of the career of John Lightfoot, a great Hebrew Scholar ; the interest taken in this language is clear from the fact that Hebrew formed part of the curriculum of many new Grammar Schools, and it is remarkable that John Lightfoot was led to his renewed study

of Hebrew by the example of Sir Rowland Cotton, in whose household John Lightfoot was Chaplain. We should note here that in 1633 Laud withdrew from country gentlemen the privilege of maintaining private chaplains.

Sir Rowland, who owned a considerable area of land north of Uttoxeter, and in High Street near the site on which the Wesleyan Chapel was built in 1812, was a country squire from the Ashley district in N.W. Staffordshire. He was the son of a London merchant and a Hebrew scholar of some standing.

There is some evidence that the Church in Uttoxeter was in need of improvement before Thomas Lightfoot, father of John, became Vicar in 1617. His predecessor, Thomas Barns, had held the living from 1566 and his signature is the earliest to be found in the old Register which still exists. It had been saved, with the edges of some pages charred by fire, as Redfern noted on p. 302 (2nd Edn.). This fire must have been that of December 1st, 1599 ; according to Redfern the Corporation of Newcastle-under-Lyme voted £10 towards a fund for relief of those who suffered the consequences. Redfern names the Vicar as William Barns, but on p. 240 in the same edition he records that the old Church Register names the Vicar as Thomas Barns.

In a survey of churches made between 1602 and 1604, this Vicar is described as having "no degree and as no preacher ; ignorant and scandalous". (He had been summoned in 1599 for assault on Richard Burton. Other defendants were John Barns, yeoman, and his wife ; also James Barns, yeoman. William Poker is named as witness). We may add that William Poker left a charitable gift to the Poor of Uttoxeter by his Will in 1636 ; viz. loaves to be distributed on Good Friday.

The second important religious event under James I was the publication of what has become known as the "Authorised" version of the Bible, "containing the Old and New Testaments translated out of the Original Tongues, and with the former translations diligently compared and revised by His Majesty's Special Command". "His Majesty" was of course King James, and the somewhat fulsome wording of the dedication is still printed in this particular version. The work occupied seven years, from the Hampton Conference of 1604 to the

publication in 1611. It would not be unfair to add to Trevelyan's dictum quoted above that the intimate knowledge of the Bible, which had begun in Tudor times, was carried further after the publication of the Authorised Version. Indeed, we have Cromwell's famous spontaneous exclamation at the battle of Dunbar in 1650 : "Let God arise, and let His enemies be scattered. Like as the mist vanisheth, so shalt Thou drive them away."

By the encouragement of Bible study James may be said to have aided the religious fervour which was exhibited later by the Parliamentary forces, though somewhat fanatical preachers were often found. On p. 208 (2nd Edn.) Redfern recorded "Attacks upon the ordinances of the Church by a Mr. Heming, who appears to have occupied a pulpit in Uttoxeter". The story of the controversy is continued on the next two pages. Redfern did not know that Mr. Heming was appointed as curate at Uttoxeter in 1648, and later Rector of Rolleston from 1654 - 1657. Redfern followed other authorities in stating that Peter Lightfoot published a strong defence of his father against Heming entitled "A Battle with a Wasp's Nest", but according to Allebone (Dictionary of Authors 1875) the "Battle with a Wasp's Nest" was written by Peter's brother, Dr. John Lightfoot, though published in Peter's name.

Possibly Dr. John preferred not to be known as the author, for he had contacts both among Parliamentarians (John Spencer, a Uttoxeter man, records that he heard a sermon preached by Dr. John Lightfoot to the House of Commons), and after the defeat of the Royalists at Marston Moor and Naseby, such men as Heming were supported by many of the ranks of the Parliamentary army. Moreover, John Lightfoot could not have had many enemies among the Royalists, for when Charles II was restored in 1660 it is on record that Dr. John offered to surrender the appointments he had been given during the previous time of war ; yet Charles II refused this surrender and John Lightfoot continued as before.

We shall later give an account of the whole of John's career ; here it will be sufficient to note that Charles II was influenced in his decision by a recommendation of John Lightfoot by Gilbert Sheldon, at one time Warden of All Souls, Oxford, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1663. Like John Lightfoot, the Archbishop was a Staffordshire man, born at Stanton, near the Weaver Hills.

Redfern gives an account of the Archbishop on p. 206 (2nd Edn.) with a sketch of the house at Stanton where Gilbert Sheldon was born. Redfern also recalls that Gilbert was the son of an employee of the Earl of Shrewsbury ; and that the Earl sponsored the boy and enabled him to obtain higher education.

We have noted that James I was pleased to find more wealth at his disposal than he had ever known in Scotland. Redfern (p. 109, 2nd Edn.) also relates that James made considerable reduction in the Duchy of Lancaster estates by gifts, especially in the Derbyshire manors, to various families. Mosley's History of Tutbury also recalls that in 1624 (the last year of his reign) James conferred knighthood on Sir Edward Vernon. Mosley also mentions some trees which were outstanding even in this district where large tracts of forest still remained. Thus the "Big Elm" between Rolleston and Tutbury, famous in 1624, grew on until, in 1816, it was killed by indiscriminate use of lime by the tenant of the land. It had reached the height of 60 feet, and at 3 feet from the ground its girth was nineteen feet. Mosley also recorded the Swilcar Lawn Oak, supposed to be 600 years old, which remained until 1945, and various trees in Bagot's woods, including the Squitch Oak, the Bagot Walking Stick — still surviving into the nineteen-seventies. The most famous of all, Beggars' Oak, was a noble tree when I first saw it in 1893 ; its branches covered an area of at least a quarter of an acre, and several were as large as ordinary trees ; these were supported by strong props, and where dead or dying branches had been sawn off close to the main trunk, there were lead sheets which protected the sawn-off ends. I have a photograph taken about the same date showing a Methodist open-air Meeting and Service, accompanied by a brass band. The group contains over 70 men, yet the branches reached beyond the large assembly.

It is an awesome thought that most of these trees were old when James I lived. The name Beggars' Oak would seem to be either a corruption of "Bagot's Oak", or literally meant the woodland meeting place of Beggars, for we know that after the dispersal of private armies when Henry VII ordered the few remaining Barons to restrict the numbers of their retainers, many bands of outlaws roamed the countryside. Their numbers were increased by many ploughmen who were thrown out of work by the landowners of the early Tudor period, whose farming policy, especially in the Midlands, favoured sheep farming rather than corn growing. In an

earlier chapter we have suggested that the old nursery rhyme "Hark ! Hark ! The dogs do bark, Beggars are coming to town" originated at this period.

We have already mentioned also that the extravagance of James led to his revival of previous methods of filling the royal purse by "Benevolences" which were no more than extortion of money from wealthy subjects ; when the response to this illegal taxation proved scanty, the granting of "monopolies" was another method of rewarding courtiers and favourites. This was the cause of the Bagot glass works closing down ; such methods of obtaining money did not lead to respect for the king, especially among those who were victims. Parliament, when it was summoned unwillingly by both James and his son, attacked these abuses. Redfern also refers to other sums of money by which the king gained ; on p. 344 (2nd Edn.) he gives a list of local gentlemen who were fined because they refused knighthoods at the Coronation of Charles I : Francis Kynnersley of Loxley paid £20, William Cotton of Crakemarsh paid £12 ; the following paid £10 each : Richard Middleton, William Hart, Luke Busby, Henry Gorringe and Roland Manlove, both of Kingstone, William Fearn of Crakemarsh, and another Henry Gorringe of Croxden. These refusals emphasise that Knighthoods, previously the reward of distinguished services, e.g. Sir Francis Drake after his circumnavigation of the world, had now become much less true "honours" ; the fees paid by those who accepted these rather doubtful "honours" were of course much higher than the fines paid by the above "gentlemen".

We find also that in 1611 James instituted the Order of Baronetage, because, says Lodge (Peerage ed. 1889) he found that his income was insufficient to meet his expenditure. Wealthy gentlemen, in return for the hereditary title, undertook to pay the Exchequer the "equivalent of three years' pay of 30 soldiers at the rate of eightpence a day." In spite of these efforts to provide a sufficient income for the Exchequer, Charles I inherited not only a kingdom in which considerable unpopularity existed for an almost totalitarian regime, but a pressing need for further income.

Besides the methods noted above, money was raised from fines in the "Prerogative" Courts (the Star Chamber, Ecclesiastical High Commission, Requests, Council of the North, etc.) and from "voluntary gifts" and forced loans.

It is clear that Charles was little more successful in these demands than James had been. Green's "Short History" p. 486, notes that from his demands in 1611 - 1614 in the whole of England, the total was but £60,000 ; it is of local interest (not noted by Redfern) that from the counties of Herefordshire and Staffordshire nothing was received. Indeed, Green wrote that this resistance was maintained through all these levies — "The two Counties sent not a penny to the last."

The first Parliament of Charles did indeed grant small subsidies to the King, because they supported war against Spain, but, led by men like Sir John Eliot, Pym, and Hampden, they stoutly insisted on freedom in legal, religious, and fiscal matters. Charles replied that Parliament's liberty consisted in counsel, but not control, and Eliot, Hampden and others were imprisoned. There may be some explanation for the refusal of Staffordshire to contribute to illegal levies, for the Earl of Essex, of Chartley, and another Midland Peer, the Earl of Warwick, were leaders of peers who refused to comply with an illegal exaction. Now Essex had been a close friend of Charles in their younger days, but Essex did become one of the Englishmen who preferred the Presbyterian form of Christianity. Many of his type were opposed to the strict rule of the Bishops, who were ready to deprive the country clergy if they failed to carry out the orders imposed by Laud.

Though Laud had full support from Charles, his despotic actions and principles which were nearer to Roman Catholicism than to Puritanism, drove many of his opponents across the Atlantic. The famous Pilgrim Fathers of 1620 emigrated as Trevelyan remarks (p. 438 of 1947 Edn.) "on account of the special character of the settlers and the reasons of their coming from England, Laud's persecution made some of the best types of small gentry, yeomen and craftsmen desire to emigrate."

Eliot died in prison, and Charles even refused to allow the family to bury him in his village in Cornwall. He had been a fearless upholder of the liberties of Parliament and the English people, and had moved the Houses of Parliament to draw up a "Petition of Right" reminding the King that his Ministers were subject to English Law, and that ordinary citizens had, during the gradual progress from Magna Carta (1215) onwards, acquired liberties which, they felt, must be maintained.

When Charles consented to this and to the "Grand Remonstrance" which Eliot, Pym, Hampden and others drew up in protest to the King, there was general rejoicing throughout the land, for the citizens thought that an era of peace and liberty was beginning. They were, unfortunately, soon disillusioned. Though Charles lost, by assassination, his favourite minister, he appointed as Buckingham's successor Weston, a man of the Duke's party, ready to carry out the Duke's methods, and, it was believed, a secret Roman Catholic. When the Spanish marriage project fell through, Charles had married a daughter of King Henry IV of France, the man who had, though a Huguenot, openly declared that he thought "Paris was well worth a Mass" and abandoned his Protestant faith. This marriage with a Roman Catholic princess was most unpopular with the seriously-minded majority, who were already anxious about the condition of the English Church under Laud.

James I had at first supported all Bishops as we have seen, because he did not wish to be dominated by Presbyterianism ; but James was shrewd enough to realise that Laud's desire to enforce his ideals not only over the English country clergy, but over the Scots as well, was a foolish act. It has been recorded that some years before, when Laud asked James to force the Scottish Church to accept a liturgy similar to the English service, James, who knew the temper of the Presbyterians better than Laud, said, "I sent him back again with the frivolous draft he had drawn. For all that, he feared not my anger, but assaulted me again with another ill-fangled platform to make that stubborn Kirk stoop more to the English . . . he knows not the stomach of that people."

But when Laud, eleven years later, obtained the support of Charles I, the chief result was to increase the numbers of emigrants to the American colonies, (3,000 emigrants were recorded in one year, and in the county of Norfolk alone thirty parish clergy were dismissed) and to remove from English parishes many earnest Christian ministers. In one case it is difficult to decide whether the result was to be regretted or not. John Milton had from his earliest student days been designed by his father to take Holy Orders, in his own words : "Coming to some maturity of years and perceiving what tyranny had invaded the Church . . . I thought it better to prefer a blameless silence before the sacred office of speaking, bought and begun with servitude."

By contrast we should compare Milton with George Herbert, who abandoned a courtly career to take orders and write poems of a religious nature, which reflected the views of Laud. His elder brother was Ambassador at Paris, and encouraged the marriage of King Charles with Henrietta Maria.

The above account of General English history from 1603 when James I succeeded Queen Elizabeth until 1629 and 1640 (the eleven years when Charles governed by his Royal Personal Power) has been briefly included here as it enables us to follow with understanding the events which affected this district during the contest between King and Parliament which began in 1642. We have given a number of instances in which the national events influenced local persons.

But we may now return to the proceedings which were recorded in the old MS. book used by Redfern ; as we have shown, Redfern was so interested in the account of how Charles I and his courtiers carried out certain "contrivements" as the MS. book calls them, with the object of taking from the inhabitants of Uttoxeter common lands and privileges which they had enjoyed "time out of mind". Actually, these "contrivements" were associated with financial matters in which there is evidence that Charles was indeed more in need than he or his father had been in previous years.

Charles succeeded to the throne in 1625, and, as Redfern records on p. 100 (2nd Edn.), in May of that year sold the Manor of Uttoxeter and other parts of the Duchy of Lancaster estates to a syndicate — Lord William Craven, Sir George Whitmore, Sir William Whitmore, and a Mr. Gibson. Redfern states that "these gentlemen immediately caused a survey of the Manor of Uttoxeter to be made". Though Redfern was not aware of it, a survey *was* made, but by order of the King ; the original of this I discovered in the Public Record Office, signed by the men who made it "by order of His Majesty" in the year 1629. There was evidently some delay following the sale, but there is no documentary evidence giving reasons for this. Moreover, the survey in the old MS. book, which Redfern assumed to have been made by Peter Lightfoot in 1658, was an exact copy of the 1629 survey, with some marginal notes. But the real value of this old MS. book lies in the pages following the survey.

These pages contain copies of documents made by some person closely connected with an attorney who dealt with matters pertaining to the Duchy of Lancaster ; each part is headed in capital letters commonly used in legal script, and evidently written by a clerk accustomed to such work.

But in addition to such topics as Uttoxeter Charters (in Latin and English), an Indenture of 1616 concerning a charitable bequest made by Anne Blount in 1594, copies of wills in which a number of charitable bequests to the town were made, these pages contain copies of an order concerning the Vicarage of Uttoxeter, dated 1331, of Thomas Alleyne's orders for his schools, dated 1558, of a "writing which was formerly made concerning the two town meadows" (this was also concerning the bridge over the Dove), and similar documents.

It is obvious that these writings, which had been preserved in the finely bound book handed to Redfern about 1860, had been laid up for about 200 years. They are all the kind of document which an attorney would have in charge for some important family or institutions. From marginal notes on some pages it would appear that the copies were made by a person who was either employed in the office of the attorney in the early years of the 17th century, or who was a trusted acquaintance of the man of law.

The head of this office must have had close connection with the manorial business of the town, and with such affairs of the Duchy of Lancaster officials as concerned the Manor. Such an attorney would probably be concerned also in legal matters, bequests, agreements and similar matters dealt with by a lawyer.

The late Charles Miller, with wide legal experience, thought that the lawyer in question was employed on legal business by the Lord of the Manor ; he also thought it probable that both the Lord of the Manor and his lawyer obtained copies of the King's survey of 1629. He expected that a second copy might appear in the archives of some local family as this was usual at that time. His opinion was proved correct, for a second copy did appear in the documents of the Kynnersley family ; it is regrettable that this second copy cannot now be traced. Both copies must originally have followed the survey now in the Duchy of Lancaster records in the Public Record Office, signed and dated 1629 by the two surveyors,

Parsons and Birch, who state that they made the survey on direct orders from King Charles. This somewhat confuses the account given by Mosley in his *History of Tutbury* (p. 217) and repeated by Redfern (p. 109, 2nd Edn.). This states that the Manor of Uttoxeter and other appendages were "disposed of, on May 24th, 1625, to Lord William Craven, Sir George Whitmore, Sir William Whitmore, and Mr. Gibson. These gentlemen immediately caused a survey of the Manor of Uttoxeter to be made and re-sold it to the inhabitants of the town for £3,120." If the Manor had passed over to the above gentlemen (who in turn were said to have sold it to several inhabitants) it is most unlikely that the King could have ordered Parsons and Byrche to make the survey of 1629 ; so too, Redfern's assumption that the survey was made by Peter Lightfoot in 1658 cannot be correct. Even if the two surveyors took four years to complete their work, they still give the King as the authority for their survey. The whole matter must remain doubtful until or unless some further Duchy records appear.

Mosley also records that at the same time (presumably 1625) the Attorney-General of the Duchy, Sir Edward Mosley, sold the timber of Uttoxeter High Wood on behalf of the king, to two Uttoxeter citizens, Richard Startin and Thomas Degg ; they in turn sold it in lots (probably with no small profit) to others.

Indirectly this transaction confirms the fact (noted in Part III of this work) that many inhabitants of the Manor had gradually accumulated some wealth and were now independent of their former Manorial lord.

Another noteworthy point is that on the date of the sale of Uttoxeter Manor as stated above, Charles had only been king for a few weeks ; this seems to indicate that he needed money quite urgently.

To return to the material in the second part of the MS. book, we find some justification for Redfern's statement that Peter Lightfoot was responsible for the whole of the contents.

Some of the copies of wills etc. were witnessed by Thomas Lightfoot, Vicar of Uttoxeter, and some by Peter Lightfoot himself. Moreover, the last and longest document "concerning the town of Uttoxeter" was certainly either written by Peter Lightfoot himself or dictated by him to a scrivener in the

lawyer's office. One passage has reference to an interview between Duchy officials and some representatives of the town, including Peter Lightfoot, and speaks of Peter as "myself". In a brief preface to the story of the business Redfern found these words: "Set down purposely to show times to come how by these cunning plottings and contrivements they may find out the like, and be taught how to prevent them if any such thing shall be set on foot hereafter". (Redfern misread "lyke" in the old script, and wrote "they may find out the toyle". He therefore stated that the proceedings were "a work of much toil". Another misreading of less importance was to put "contriveings" for "contrivements"). All this is to be found on p. 114 of 2nd Edn.

As we have already stated, on pp. 20 and 21 of Part III of this work, Redfern was so impressed by the information he found in the old MS. book that he rapidly passed in his story from 1474 to 1625. He was naturally interested in the events of the early years of Charles I's reign. Besides the sale of Uttoxeter Manor related above, Redfern gave in his 2nd Edn. a much longer account of the Duchy of Lancaster proceedings regarding the High Wood lands than he had in his 1865 book. On p. 109 of his 1886 Edn. he stated that previous accounts of these proceedings (he was probably referring to Mosley's story in the "History of Tutbury") differed from his own view of the Duchy actions after closer study of the documents copied in the latter part of the MS. book. He considered that, in the words already quoted from the Preface, there had been "cunning contrivements" and that the case had "quite a different complexion from another brief one which has appeared." He also spoke of "the great injustice which was about to be inflicted upon the town, and hence it was undertaken with no little cunning". The whole story occupies no less than 23 pages of about foolscap size in the MS. book, and this proved too much for Redfern to transcribe in full. He gave a fairly complete story of the first documents, noting that there were rather sarcastic marginal comments (certainly by Peter Lightfoot) on the manner in which the Duchy sought to deny to the inhabitants of Uttoxeter the privileges of common grazing etc. on the High Wood which they had enjoyed "time out of mind".

This story concerned acts of Duchy officials begun in 1635, that is, about half-way through the period in which Charles for eleven years tried to carry on the government without any Parliament. Indeed, the last pages of the account are concerned with events of 1637, and we know from other

sources that the proceedings had not ended when the Civil War began in 1642.

It was fortunate both for the whole town and for certain citizens threatened by the Star Chamber Court that the outbreak of war occurred just at that date. After the victory of the Parliament and the execution of Charles I in 1649, all such legal threats had ceased, though in 1660 when Charles II was restored, the Duchy of Lancaster estates again became Royal property.

The manorial rights, sold by Charles I, remained the property of the purchasers ; and Uttoxeter Manor, with the exception of a few fields, no longer existed. The High Wood, part of the old Uttoxeter Ward of Needwood, about which the dispute had arisen, still remained part of Uttoxeter common land until it was enclosed many years later.

The story of the 23 pages in the MS. book is headed : "A True relation of certaine transactions and passages which doe concerne the encloseing of parte of the Common or Waste Grounde called Uttoxeter Wood". This is followed by the passage quoted above beginning "set downe purposely . . ."

At a future date I hope to transcribe the whole 23 pages of script. Here it will suffice to provide a summary of the various lengthy documents which must have been copied by our scribe from various Duchy of Lancaster records, some of which had been available to Mosley when he wrote his "History of Tutbury". Like Redfern, he probably found these too lengthy to be transcribed in full. Mosley's comments, as Redfern hinted, gave a rather different (and milder) complexion to the case. Possibly this was due to the part played in the "contrivements" by Sir Oswald Mosley's ancestor, Sir Edward Mosley, which Sir Oswald might not wish to be published ; or indeed, it may well be that the story preserved by the Uttoxeter scribe in the MS. book was never read by Sir Oswald, and the marginal comments, definitely due to Peter Lightfoot, were not seen by Mosley. Some events later in the story as given by Redfern were considered by him to have been discreditable to two townsmen, William Poker and William Sherwin. They had been sent to petition the king at Nottingham, when the court was there ; their expenses were paid, and they were to seek aid from the Earl of Essex, of Chartley, in their mission. However, the Earl himself told Peter Lightfoot that he had waited for the two petitioners to approach him, but though they were at Nottingham all the

time, they did nothing at all in the matter, and Redfern blames them most severely for this. Possibly they fully deserved his censure ; or perhaps the two townsmen were too timid in their approach to the Royal Court. Peter relates in his commentary that other Uttoxeter townsmen later complained bitterly in the lobby when Parliament eventually met in London. This must have been late in 1640 ; Charles had been compelled to call a Parliament early in that year, but had dissolved it almost immediately when the members demanded reform before granting subsidies : hence the name "The Short Parliament". But later in the same year the king, who had a serious threat from Scotland on his hands, in addition to the many complaints of his English subjects, called a second Parliament, which came to be known as the "Long Parliament". It was almost certainly to this Parliament that Uttoxeter citizens wished to present their petition as Lightfoot related.

A summary of the events, beginning in 1625, runs as follows, largely in the exact terms of the original : In 1625, the officers of the Duchy, one being Sir Edward Mosley, sold the timber of Uttoxeter Wood (or Ward) which was "very much", to Thomas Degg and Richard Startyn, two Uttoxeter citizens (whose descendants can be found to the present day). They in turn sold the timber "by peece meale" to all "that pleased to buy it". In a short time the whole ground was cleared. Soon afterwards "projectors" began to work. First, "two carryers" (Redfern misread this as "two strangers") appeared, who as they travelled upon the wood, did hear of the taking in of Leicester Forest, and other commons. These men thereupon "wrought with Sir Edward Mosley", then Attorney of the Duchy, living at Rolleston, that he would take in the greatest share (of the Uttoxeter Ward) for the king, and admit those two and four other partners to deal for the rest ("as they did pretend") for the good of the poor. This could not be done without the consent of the freeholders, and to gain their consent was thought impossible. Therefore Sir Edward thought good to proceed by bill against the projectors and their partners. (This part of the story is not easy to follow ; we are left to suppose that the two carryers and their partners are the "projectors", who hoped that if a large part of the Uttoxeter Ward could be declared the King's sole property, they might obtain the other part. But why Sir Edward was to present a bill against the projectors to secure that end is not made clear. On a later page we find that "John Carter and Edward Oldfield, and one or two more, stood in great hope to gain what they looked for."

This can only mean that the "carriers" were most likely to have known these Uttoxeter citizens before the business began.

The "carriers" are said to have heard, as they were "on the road", of the enclosing of "Leicester forest", i.e. Charnwood Forest. Redfern interpreted "on the road" as on the road at Uttoxeter High Wood (p. 110 2nd Edn.), but it would seem more likely that as "carriers" their business had taken them along the line of the modern A.50, passing from Uttoxeter via Tutbury, Burton-on-Trent, and Ashby, to Leicester. This was actually the route followed ten years later by the Royalists who carried Leicester by storm, and in their turn were destroyed by the Parliamentary army at Naseby in Northamptonshire, only twenty odd miles beyond Leicester.

The bill, given in full in the record, is dated February 9th, 1635, and was addressed to Lord Newburgh, a Privy Councillor and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. It stated that the King as Duke of Lancaster was owner of a great area of land called Uttoxeter Ward, one of the wards of the Needwood Forest or chase, about 500 acres in extent, which brought in profit yearly to the king. It had been heretofore stocked with deer and other beasts and birds. All these had been destroyed by some of the local inhabitants without any permission of the king ; though lying waste, it could be replenished if His Majesty desired, as he was the undoubted owner.

The bill requested that Lord Newburgh should require Lawrence Dawson, John Dynes, John Carter, Edward Oldfield, Edward Moore, Robert Gilbert, Luke Busby, Thomas Mastergent, Peter Lightfoot, Richard Oldfield, and others not then known, to be summoned as defendants who claimed some rights in the waste called Utoxeter Ward, or common pasture there. Yet in truth they had no such rights. It was requested that a writ might be directed to the persons named summoning them to appear before the Chancellor in the Duchy Court to answer the premises, and to obey any orders which seemed just to the Chancellor.

All the defendants, except Peter Lightfoot, made a joint reply acknowledging that the land did in fact really belong to the king. Peter Lightfoot was, as Redfern stated, clearly the author of this account, calling "Peter Lightfoot" myself.

Redfern transcribed part of the documents, with some minor errors ; but one error makes the story rather difficult to follow. On p.121 the transcription gives Peter Lightfoot's

account to be "Thus far the first *petitioners*, John Carter, Edward Oldfield, and one or two more, stood in good hope to gain what they looked for. Means was made by the town to the *Court of Westminster*"

What Peter Lightfoot actually wrote was : "Thus far the first *projectors*, John Carter, Edward Oldfield, and one or two more, stood in *great* hope to gain what they looked for. Means was made by the town to the *Earl of Essex*"

From the true account given by Peter Lightfoot we can now see that the two "strangers", i.e. "carryers" with one or two others must have approached Sir Edward Moseley with a proposal for a plot to acquire at least part of the Uttoxeter Wood. Among the "one or two others" must have been John Carter and Edward Oldfield, men well-known to Peter Lightfoot ; out of the list given on p. 170 2nd Edn. of Redfern we are not told how many were included in the "others" who must have been privy to the "plotting and contrivements" mentioned above ; but all those mentioned in the list did sign the acknowledgment that the king was the true owner of Uttoxeter Wood, except Peter Lightfoot.

One of those who signed was Lawrence Dawson, curate to Peter's father Thomas Lightfoot, Vicar of Uttoxeter. It may be that even the curate was one of the plotters, but one would have thought this to be improbable ; and the same may be said of such prominent and generous citizens as John Dynes, William Poker, and Thomas Mastergent, whose charitable gifts were well known to Peter Lightfoot, for he had witnessed some of the legal documents concerning these men and their families. (Thomas Mastergent was related by marriage to the Lightfoot family, and Luke Busby's family were close friends of Thomas Alleyne, who founded the three Grammar Schools at Uttoxeter, Stevenage, and Stone, in 1558).

However this may be, what Peter himself writes is that he refused to sign with the others ; strangely enough, his refusal had no unpleasant consequences to himself, for he was "dismissed the Court, they being unwilling to hear any contradiction."

We are still left with the question "Why was it necessary for Sir Edward Moseley, Attorney General of the Duchy of Lancaster, to draw up a bill against the "projectors" some of whom were plotting with him to gain some of the land of Uttoxeter Ward?"

It may be that some of the sarcastic remarks made by Peter Lightfoot in the margin of his account, were caused by his discovery of the plotting, though if he had this knowledge we might have expected some disclosure and action on his part ; and of such action there is no evidence.

It may be significant that both John Carter and Edward Oldfield were in fact in possession of land near Mynors' land on the High Wood, and of some plots in the "Woodfield" in the same area so that they might be in great hope of getting Duchy land to add to their holdings nearby ; but Peter Lightfoot's documents do not mention these circumstances. Redfern's confusion of "The Earl of Essex" with the "Court at Westminster" is difficult to explain, but it may have been caused by Peter Lightfoot's addition to the story of how William Sherwin and William Poker did nothing to ask help from the Earl of Essex when they were sent to Nottingham with a petition to King Charles who was there.

After relating the failure of the two delegates, Peter goes on to say that some time later (in 1640) some Utttoxeter men thronged the lobby at Westminster in an attempt to secure the cancellation of the Duchy Court orders. We can well imagine, however, that Peter Lightfoot was disgusted by the attempts of some of his fellow-townsmen to benefit themselves, while pretending that they were striving (see p. 118 of Redfern 2nd Ed.) "for the benefit of the poor inhabitants of Utttoxeter."

If, on the other hand, some at least of the "projectors" genuinely desired to aid the poor inhabitants, it is good to record here that many years later the "High Wood Trust" was a recognised charity for helping Utttoxeter citizens in need.

It would seem from Peter Lightfoot's account of the answer made by Lawrence Dawson and others (except Peter himself) that unless those signing the answer were indeed hypocritical, there was genuine concern for the poor ; the answer runs : "the poor inhabitants of Utttoxeter, who have little or no other means to keep their kine upon for the necessary provision of their houses, and if that the same (land) or any part thereof do happen to be taken from them and enjoyed in severaltie by others, it will tend to the impoverishment of divers poor people . . . all and every which matters and things these defendants and every of them are ready to aver and prove." Peter Lightfoot gave an account of the "bill" or "information" by which Sir Edward Mosley used his authority as Attorney-General of the Duchy of Lancaster to ensure the

appearance before the Court of the Duchy of Lawrence Dawson, John Dynes, John Carter, Edward Oldfield, Edward Moore, Robert Gilbert, Luke Busby, Thomas Mastergent, Peter Lightfoot, Richard Oldfield and divers others unknown, who when their names shall be known, His Majesty's Attorney (i.e. Sir Edward Mosley) prayeth at a certain day and under a certain paine therein . . . to appear before the Duchy Court of Lancaster and there to answer the premises and further to stand to and abide all such order and decree." This story, given by one who is actually mentioned in the list, and who knew all about the proceedings, must be accepted as correct, and no doubt there should have been a similar record in the archives of the Duchy. But the Duchy records, compiled by or with the authority of Sir Edward Mosley, naturally omitted the fact that there were (known of course to Peter Lightfoot) "plottings and contrivements" between Sir Edward and the "projectors". Hence Sir Oswald Mosley, writing 200 years later, did not include all the details set down by Peter Lightfoot, and preserved in the old MS. book used by Redfern. The latter evidently found Peter's account difficult to follow ; thus he read "two carryers" as "two strangers", and mistook the "road at the High Wood" for the road to Leicester and the Charnwood Forest.

Redfern rather surprisingly made a number of errors when reading Peter Lightfoot's script, for most of his extracts from the recorded documents are correct. The reader will be surprised to learn that on pp. 126 and 127 (2nd Edn.) there are no less than 25 transcription errors. Peter Lightfoot's handwriting is by no means difficult to decipher, as Redfern himself showed by his accurate transcription of other documents but in a few instances the errors tend to give an inaccurate impression. Besides this, Lightfoot himself made the story somewhat confusing, for he later mentioned that the "projectors", i.e. those who began the plotting in conjunction with Sir Edward Mosley, included several townsmen "who had great hopes of obtaining some of the land" ; it is significant that Peter makes no further reference to the two "carryers". The citizens who made answer to the "information" laid by Sir Edward, had agreed that the king was the owner of the Uttoxeter Wood, and we have to wonder whether Sir Edward really intended to plot with them as at first had been proposed. At any rate he applied to the Chancellor of the Duchy for a writ against those townsmen ordering them to appear before the Duchy Court. The sarcastic comments of Peter Lightfoot in his account compare the first proceedings of Sir Edward and the "projectors" to men playing a game in which "most

of the parties were of a side". The request made by Sir Edward to Lord Newburgh, the Chancellor of the Duchy, was dated February 9th, 1635, actually ten years after the sale of the Uttoxeter Ward timber to Thomas Degg and Richard Startyn. It is worth noting, too, that the "joint and several answer" of Lawrence Dawson and the other defendants was dated May 14th, 1636. (Peter Lightfoot says of this answer : "myself standing out, after a little time was dismissed the Court, they being unwilling to hear any contradiction"). Sir Edward Mosley reported to the Duchy Court that the defendants willingly submitted themselves to the Court, but there is a marginal note, made by Peter on this statement, which runs : "Nothing true, for they stood out generally to the last, except three or four."

Despite the acknowledgment made by the defendants, the next account made by Peter Lightfoot was to the effect that the King appointed a commission to ensure that "all the inhabitants (of Uttoxeter) and commoners or pretenders to have common upon the said ward" should certify the Duchy Court of their submission. The Court was next informed by a Mr. Bannister and Mr. Aylofffe that the inhabitants "in all obedience have submitted themselves to His Majesty's pleasure." This was confirmed by Sir Edward Mosley, but Peter Lightfoot's marginal comment runs as given above. However, the Court ordered that all the other inhabitants "who had not answered the said information shall acknowledge the same by some instrument under their hands to satisfy the Court of their submission."

Peter Lightfoot next recorded that King Charles issued a further Commission to "Sir Edward Moseley, Attorney-General of our Duchy of Lancaster, Sir Edward Vernon, Knight, Simon Every, Esq., Receiver-General of our said Duchy, Walter Vernon, Ellis Woodroffe, Thomas Gell, and Thomas Aylofffe." These commissioners were to summon all inhabitants of Uttoxeter who had not consented to the judgment which had been agreed by the Uttoxeter men previously named. The Commission were empowered to summon before them all commoners who had not given full consent to the proposed division of Uttoxeter Ward, and to insist upon their consent.

But the document, copied in full by Peter Lightfoot (this shows that he had access to Duchy records) also ordered that the proposed division of the land should be "fit and reasonable" We can only conclude that this reasonableness was not genuine,

for Peter's marginal comment is "In the bill it is a gracious purpose to improve the same (land) for the good of his people and the whole commonwealth". Peter could not reconcile this pretended purpose with the fact that part of the land was to be devoted entirely "to our, i.e. King Charles', best benefit and advantage." We cannot omit also the fact that Mosley recorded that the portion eventually agreed to be the King's property "was granted to Mr. Nevil, one of the officers of the King's bedchamber, and amounted . . . to five hundred acres". Peter Lightfoot's comments on the whole business seem to be well justified.

Mosley (p. 219 — History of Tutbury) also notes that Mr. Nevil enjoyed the income from his grant without interruption until just before war broke out in 1642 ; but considerable damage was done to Mr. Nevil's land by some disgruntled Uttoxeter soldiers. As a result of this damage, some Uttoxeter inhabitants were summoned to answer for it in the Star Chamber court, and no doubt would have suffered severely if the outbreak of war in 1642 and the death of Charles in 1649 had not prevented. This information about the Star Chamber proceedings was found by Sir Oswald Mosley in some family papers, and does not appear to have been published before.

Peter Lightfoot copied the orders of Charles to the appointed Commissioners to the effect that the land to be divided should be surveyed and have fixed boundaries clearly laid down. Peter's sarcastic comments on this are first "Only 15 out of 250 commoners submitted (to the division of the land), and even then on conditions that "they might have it themselves or some of them" ; next, in regard to the appointment of a surveyor : "appointed only by William Spragg". The 1629 Survey which we have quoted several times previously shows that William Spragg already held land near Woodlands Hall, i.e. close to the area which was permitted to remain in the hands of the commoners ; he also rented some of Walter Mynors' land ; Peter Lightfoot was certainly right in hinting that Spragg was not a disinterested person in appointing a surveyor to fix boundary lines.

The Mosley family documents mentioned above record that the portion of the Uttoxeter Wood not appropriated by the King was "divided amongst the freeholders of Uttoxeter in lieu of their rights of common." As the last document copied by Peter Lightfoot into the MS. book used by Redfern is dated May 1637, the final adjustment of the division of the

land, and the grant of the King's share to Mr. Nevil in 1639 were not recorded ; we have therefore only the record made by Sir Oswald Mosley from his family papers to show how the freeholders fared. But Peter Lightfoot must have known that the land did in fact pass to these freeholders, and we can therefore be sure that Peter's statements about "cunning plotting" and about some townsmen being "in great hope to gain what they looked for" were indeed correct.

We have already stated that in some parts Peter's account consists of copies of official documents, and that it is not easy to follow ; Redfern's account thus suffered in some details, but on the whole we can agree with his pride in Peter's exposure of the trickery involved. Redfern also omitted the facts given by Mosley concerning the freeholders of the town obtaining their shares in the division. He was therefore unable to state how many, if any, of the first "projectors" did gain "what they looked for" ; and his misreading of "injunction" as "information" in transcribing the last of Peter Lightfoot's MS. really confuses the story of the proceedings of the Commissioners. His paragraph, on p. 128, 2nd Edn. : "This commission was from Sir Edward Mosley to Lawrence Dawson and John Dynes, the inhabitants of Uttoxeter" this appears to add even more confusion to an already puzzling story. Nowhere in Peter's writings is there any note of such a commission, and it is indeed doubtful whether Sir Edward had power to appoint a commission at all to anybody.

(As I have already stated, it is intended that when this revision of Redfern is completed, and when later events in the story of Uttoxeter have been put on record, a complete transcription of Peter Lightfoot's pages concerning the High Wood land may be made).

During the years when all these events regarding Uttoxeter Ward were taking place, the king was attempting to govern without a Parliament. His illegal taxation, e.g. the imposition of ship money on all parts of the Kingdom, the resistance of such men as John Hampden, and the illegal imprisonment of Sir John Eliot in the Tower and his death in 1632, are instances of actions which caused the rising anger of many Englishmen. Moreover, the high-handed actions of Laud as Archbishop of Canterbury, e.g. his treatment of Prynne, his dismissal of many earnest clergy, caused many Protestants to join the "Mayflower" emigrants in North America. There is an unconfirmed legend that Cromwell himself at one time was determined to join them.

King Charles was mainly supported in his efforts to govern without any Parliament by Archbishop Laud, who was responsible for the Court of High Commission, and Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Stratford, who was prepared to bring an Irish army to aid Charles. The English country gentlemen were normally royalists, and under the Tudor sovereigns began to take up seriously their duties in the counties as Magistrates ; Shakespeare's country J.P., Robert Shallow, Esquire, though an obvious caricature, has some traits of a more serious country gentleman, ready to resent insults, as we see from the opening scene in the "Merry Wives of Windsor" Shakespeare's portrayal of the Justice of the Peace in 1599 (usually recognised as the date of that Play) permits us to realise what such a Magistrate might have been when torn between loyalty to a sovereign and resentment to tyranny, especially in money matters. He would also have become more religious personally and still suspicious of any connections with Spain or France.

In this district we have instances of all these influences upon both aristocrate and middle classes. While the majority of noble families supported the Royalists when war actually broke out in 1642, some took the opposite view. Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex and owner of Chartley Castle, is mentioned in several places in the MS. book used by Redfern ; Essex was a companion of Charles when they were young men at Court, but was the General of the Parliamentary army until superseded by Fairfax and Cromwell in 1644. It was to Essex that a deputation from the citizens of Utttoxeter went in 1636 when they feared that they were in danger of losing their common rights in Utttoxeter Ward of Needwood Forest. Though the deputation failed, according to Lightfoot's account, through the poor conduct of William Poker and William Sherwin, we find that more determined representatives pressed into the lobby at Westminster to try to get redress from Parliament when at last Charles found himself compelled to call a Parliament in 1640. Peter Lightfoot tells of these efforts but does not say how successful they were. The MS. book, in which he had at least a share in recording these matters, contains no entries after the copy of an application for an injunction against all who had claimed common rights in the land which had been divided between the King and the commoners, these commoners being held responsible for the damage done to the royal fences by "some of the ruder sort." As Redfern added to this account, the Utttoxeter commoners might have suffered for the violence of these "ruder sort" if war had not put an end to the proceedings.

With regard to the attitude of local aristocrats to the war, two instances should be noted. The Bagot family had suffered considerable financial loss owing to arbitrary actions of the Stuart dynasty ; in 1616 Sir Walter Bagot had complained that his glass works in Bagot's Park and the neighbourhood were ruined by the grant of a monopoly to others ; yet when war came in 1642 Harvey and Richard Bagot joined the royal force at Stafford under the Earl of Northampton. The Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research records that both Capt. Richard Bagot and Capt. Harvey Bagot were wounded at the Battle of Hopton Heath in March 1643. Later we find that Prince Rupert appointed Harvey Bagot (now Colonel) to be Governor of Lichfield Close. Capt. Richard Bagot was also promoted to Colonel, and took part in defence of Lichfield. He was with Charles I's army which passed from Uttoxeter to Leicester in 1645 on the way to Naseby. He was wounded in the battle on June 14th, and died on July 1st.

In the opening days of the war the County of Stafford seems to have been more content on keeping peace ; a meeting was called by the Sheriff of Staffordshire three months after the King raised his standard at Nottingham (August 1642) ; the meeting agreed that forces should be enrolled to keep the county quiet, and appointed a number of officers ; but when fighting in earnest began, some officers appear to have decided either for or against the King. It might well have been that some country gentlemen were inclined to support the Parliament, for their relations with the Stuart kings were by no means cordial. No less than 260 Staffordshire gentlemen refused to accept knighthoods, costing at least £60 each in fees at the coronation of Charles I ; all compounded for at least £10 each in fines. In reply, the king appointed various commissions to enforce payment by defaulters, and the Victoria County History of Staffs. remarks that these exactions made country gentlemen opposed to the King. However, compulsory knighthoods and other arbitrary actions were abolished by the Long Parliament in 1640, so that some opponents of Charles than changed their attitude.

Another grievance had been caused to some aristocratic families by Archbishop Laud, who had forbidden the custom of engaging family chaplains ; Uttoxeter was affected by this rule, for John Lightfoot, Peter's elder brother, was household chaplain to Sir Rowland Cotton.

It is perhaps not realised in the 20th century that many country clergymen were inclined towards Presbyterianism ;

even in 1604 no fewer than 300 "Puritan" clergy had been evicted from their livings, and more suffered the same fate after Laud's appointment as Archbishop in 1633.

There seems little doubt that Dr. John Lightfoot (his life story will be recorded fully later in this work) was not wholly opposed to the leaning towards Presbyterianism, which was widespread at that time ; and he was not regarded with enmity by the Parliament. Indeed, the period in which his career made notable advance began in 1642 and continued even after the Restoration in 1660. In 1642 he left his brother Josiah as Curate of his living at Ashley, Staffs. and went to London as Rector of St. Bartholomew's near the Exchange. He was one of the clergy who sat in the Assembly of Divines at Westminster in 1643. By then he was famous in Western Europe as a Hebrew scholar, and was Master of St. Catherine's, Cambridge. During the Interregnum he became Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, and John Spencer, the Uttoxeter-born Librarian of Sion College, London, records that he heard Dr. Lightfoot preach to the House of Commons at that time.

Yet Dr. Lightfoot never officially abandoned his adherence to the Church of England. He opposed some clergy who were seeking to abandon some forms of service which the Presbyterians disliked ; e.g. he insisted that Christmas Day services in the English Prayer Book should be retained. From this it is clear that in many ways the ordinary people were not so seriously involved as might be expected ; also that a number of Englishmen, while they desired better government than Charles I had maintained, still hesitated about taking up arms against him.

This attitude is clear even in the Uttoxeter district ; a pamphlet printed in London soon after Charles marched through Uttoxeter from Nottingham in September 1642, relates how he found on arriving at the town there was a "little army" of knights and gentlemen. They said that they came "rather as petitioners than opposers", and begged him to abandon his evil counsellors. It was indeed difficult to decide whether the king himself or his "evil counsellors" had caused the constitutional and other differences to arise.

After two conferences on the borders of Staffordshire and Derbyshire between the chief country gentlemen of the area, Sir John Gell determined to support Parliament ; at Lichfield, Thomas Mynors did the same, although others of his family took the opposite side. Thomas Mynors continued to support Parliament and sat in the Parliaments up to 1660, though he

admitted later that he opposed the execution of Charles in 1649. Richard Mynors, relative of Thomas, served as a Royalist Captain, and had a distinguished career in the Navy after 1660.

The difficulties in which the Uttoxeter officials found themselves are obvious when we consider the conflicting orders which they were expected to obey as each of the contesting sides in turn controlled this part of the country. Thus we have these instructions issued by Charles to the Sheriff of Staffordshire (Sir Edward Mosley) soon after war broke out.

To our Trusty and Well-beloved our High Sheriff of our County of Stafford :

Our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby command and authorise you to raise sufficient forces of horse and foot, to be paid by the County, and to put the same into the Castle of Tutbury for the defence and security of the same against all levies of the rebels and all other ill-affected persons in that and the neighbouring counties. And we hereby require you to use your utmost industry with our well-affected subjects in that our county, to persuade them to contribute horse, arms, ammunition, plate or money, to us for our assistance and defence. And we do hereby authorise you by yourself, or such fit persons as you shall appoint on that behalf, to receive the same. And you are to return to us a list of their names and contributions that we may make them satisfaction when God shall enable us, and remember it upon all occasions to their advantage. And we require and authorise you to convene all the gentlemen, clergy, freeholders and other our well-affected subjects of our county to the purpose aforesaid. And for so doing this shall be your sufficient warrant.

Given at our Court at Reading this
26th of November, 1642.

To our trusty and well-beloved our High Sheriff of our County of Stafford :

Two remarks may be made on this document ; first, that the County was expected to pay for the safe holding of Tutbury Castle ; this was, of course, the property of the Duchy of Lancaster ; the people of Staffordshire might well have

considered that at least some of the expense was the responsibility of the Duchy, or, if the Castle were to be regarded as a part of national defence against rebels, then the Government could be regarded as the responsible authority for such defence. The wording of the royal order shows that in addition to paying towards the defence expenses, the wealthier inhabitants were expected to make voluntary contributions to the royal funds.

It is clear also, that Charles made a definite promise to re-pay these voluntary contributions when "God shall enable us". It may well have been the king's intention to do so, but after his execution, and when in 1660 his son was restored, there were many complaints that Charles II was not fulfilling the promises made in 1642. Writing of this period (1661) Trevelyan says: "Many cavaliers failed to recover lands which they had been forced to sell . . . they were bitterly aggrieved."

As we have seen, even in 1642 many local squires and yeomen hesitated about their support for either side. In Uttoxeter, where Charles stayed for one night at Mr. Wood's house (this stood at the top of Dove Bank until after Mary Howitt's childhood) Prince Rupert showed the high-handed tendency of many Cavaliers; when he ordered some townsmen to join the royal forces, they refused, and the Prince ordered their houses to be burnt. On the other hand, when Stafford, a royal stronghold at the time of the Battle of Hopton Heath, was taken in 1643 by Parliamentary troops, it became the Headquarters of a Committee which controlled most of the County. This committee issued orders that Uttoxeter, and other places, should make regular contributions to the expenses of the Parliament forces; one may guess how heavily these demands fell upon the inhabitants. We find from parish accounts which have survived (Redfern quoted from these in 2nd Edn. pp. 136 *et seq.*) that both sides in turn forced contributions towards their expenses. After a Parliament Committee had been instituted at Stafford several items concerning Uttoxeter were entered in the accounts of their proceedings; some records are not too well composed for a modern reader to follow. Thus the entry for February 1643 runs: "Ordered that six horses of John Dines of Uttoxeter, taken by Col. Breans and Major Medhope's troops, shall be admitted upon the public faith to be £30, to be repaid with interest according to the propositions of Parliament." Another entry, March 15th, states: "The weekly pay of Uttoxeter shall be assigned to Capt. Walter Snowe for the payment of

his officers and soldiers, making his account to the Committee at the end of every month both of receipts and disbursements”.

Another item runs : “William Eyton of Uttoxeter sent to for £30, and, refusing to pay, to be imprisoned until he makes performance.”

All these items are given in “The Committees at Stafford, 1643 - 45”, by Pennington and Roots.

The authors remark that “Staffordshire is the most disputable area of all in the strategy of the War.”

They also quote that on February 6th “the Constable and inhabitants of Uttoxeter having paid £50, is ordered that £50 more behind and unpaid shall be paid by Feb. 15th.”

They state that “both Burton and Uttoxeter were invaded by the king’s forces during the summer ; Tutbury was held by Col. Hastings against the Parliament’s forces besieging it.”

“Richard Flyer became a member of the Committee on June 17th, 1643 — a Barrister of the Inner Temple”. Richard’s grandfather was a mercer of Uttoxeter ; the family house stood near the site of the Gardner house, (erroneously termed the Manor House, as Redfern pointed out on p. 153 of 2nd Edn.) and the Duchy of Lancaster survey of 1629 mentions three members of the family — Ralph, probably father of Richard, also Francis Flyer. Besides the mansion at the top of High Street, they owned land on the High Wood, and an area of woodland on the Uttoxeter side of Bagot’s Woods is still known as “Flyer’s Coppice”. It seems that Richard Flyer in 1643 was a supporter of Parliament.

In 1643, some property, still in existence near Kingstone and still known as Wanfield, was owned by the Manlove family, one of whom “Mr. Alexander Manlove do stand committed in custody of the Marshal until he advances £30 upon the propositions”. A later entry orders that : “Mr. Alexander Manlove be forthwith released upon the payment of £5 now in hand and £5 more upon Monday come fortnight, for which £10 he is to have public faith. Mr. Thorley undertakes for the payment of the latter £5.”

Another entry concerns James Sergeant of Uttoxeter. (The 1629 Survey lists him as holding one tenement from Edward Allen's land, formerly belonging to Lord Aston, called a "sell", i.e. an inn. He also purchased one close of pasture and one meadow at Little Bramshall, i.e. on the South side of the village ; he also owned four acres at Kiddle-sick by the side of Bromshulfe Lane). He was one of nine persons ordered by the Stafford Committee to be brought in, "persons whose names are subscribed to lend money upon the propositions. It appears that James Sergeant's offer to lend money was forced upon him, for the Committee ordered that, having paid £10 he shall pay £40 more upon the propositions and to stand committed till he pay so much, unless upon his oath he give cause to make abatement".

Another entry later states "that James Sergeant of Uttoxeter shall pay next Saturday to our treasurer without fail, which he undertakes to do, and upon this he is to be enlarged" — then (in a different handwriting) ten pounds of which money Mr. Simcox is to receive for the use of powdermen and workmen." "Powdermen" may refer to men in charge of ammunition ; if so the "workmen" probably were employed to make gunpowder. On the other hand, they may have been engaged in salting or preserving meat for army supplies.

Some of these entries suggest that the Committee at times acted in a tyrannical manner ; but other entries give a different picture ; thus we find :-

"The officers and men of Capt. Henry Jackson took divers horses, and plundered two houses. Ordered that Capt. Jackson shall deliver all the horses and goods which were taken, and answer to this on their peril". So that justice was sometimes done. We also find a similar forbearance in the case of Timothy Startin. The 1629 survey shows that Richard and William Startin held between them over ninety acres in Uttoxeter, and the old map in Uttoxeter Church of uncertain date shows Timothy Startin as occupier of the family lands. I have found in Uttoxeter Church Registers that Timothy and Ann Startin had a daughter Lettice baptized on January 13th, 1637 ; also that William Startin (probably Timothy's uncle) was buried on February 6th, 1630, but I have been unable to find a record of Richard Startin's death.

It seems highly probable that Richard Startin was dead by 1644, when the Committee at Stafford restored to Ann and Timothy Startin their property which had been confiscated because Timothy was a Royalist. Ann Startin had approached the Committee, saying that without means she could not maintain herself and children. The restoration of her husband's land shows that the Committee could be lenient on occasion.

Another reference to Uttoxeter mentioned in the account of the Committee's proceedings provides a somewhat amusing example of the fact that families were divided in their allegiance either to King or Parliament. John Shallcross of Uttoxeter is recorded in the 1629 Duchy survey as having over fifty acres of land in various parts of the town. The Committee sequestrated most of his property because he was a "delinquent". But an application was made to the Committee stating that his wife was an accepted well-wisher to Parliament, and was now impoverished and had suffered much. The Committee decided that Mrs. Shallcross should "enjoy all rents and profits of the said lands" ; and the sequestrators were said to be "content" with this arrangement.

An entry of December 1643 throws some light on agricultural matters ; it becomes evident that occupiers of land, whether as owners or tenants, looked upon cattle as important assets. Some cattle belonging to a Mr. Lees of Stafford had strayed into the "Lordship of Uttoxeter". The strays were taken and sold for the use of Sir Thomas Milward (he farmed the land by the R. Dove at Eaton, and on one occasion entertained King Charles, as Redfern notes on pp. 138 and 139 of 2nd Edn.), Thomas Hart (a wealthy landowner, ancestor of Thomas Hart, the Uttoxeter banker), Mr. Gorringe (another landowner, also holder of market and fair tolls), Sir Roland Manlove, who held land at Kingstone and Uttoxeter, John Shallcross (mentioned above), Richard Middleton (who owned over 100 acres of land in different places around Uttoxeter), and Timothy Startin (mentioned above). It seems clear that the sale of these cattle was at least doubtful, and possibly dishonest. In the meantime Mr. Lees, the real owner of the cattle, had died. It appears that by some means either Mrs. Lees, now a widow, or the Committee, had discovered what had happened to the cattle.

The entry in the Committee records that Thomas Hart, Richard Middleton, and Sir Rowland Manlove had sold the cattle, and were ordered to return to Mrs. Dorothy Lees

their share of the money or appear before the Committee. This entry is somewhat vague regarding the shares of the other gentlemen ; it seems unlikely that if they had received any part of the proceeds, the Committee would have treated them more favourably than the others. The whole episode indicates the abnormal circumstances of the period. We do not know whether the Lees of Stafford were for the Parliament or not, but it is possible that the Uttoxeter gentlemen acted as they did because they would consider that they were attacking an enemy.

Against this view we must note that Mr. Hart received support from the Committee in the matter of a stolen horse. Corporal Hunter, a Parliamentary soldier, had taken this horse from Mr. Hart, and had refused to obey the committee when ordered to return it ; Hunter was imprisoned for this refusal and for his contempt of the Committee. But despite the punishment, the vague record of the Committee does not clearly state that Mr. Hart received his horse back again.

Another case recorded in the Committee's proceedings is of interest to Uttoxeter. Just after Christmas in 1644 the Parliamentary authority in London had ordered Mrs. Jane Lathrop, widow, whose family had connections with Uttoxeter, Crakemarsh and Bramshall, to make a weekly contribution towards their army expenses. She was unable to meet the demand because Thomas Rushton of Bramshall, and Mrs. Barratt, another widow, of Uttoxeter, had fallen into arrears of rent due to Mrs. Lathrop. The Committee at Stafford ordered Thomas Rushton and Mrs. Barratt to pay the debt to Mrs. Jane Lathrop's son within one week, or in default to appear before them at Stafford.

Redfern seems to have had no access to the Committee's records at Stafford, but (on p. 420, 2nd Edn.) when writing of the foundation of almshouses at Uttoxeter by a William Lathrop in 1700, he gave other details of the family as far back as 1664 ; indeed, when information was available, Redfern seldom failed to record it.

It is of local interest, too, that two at least of the Parliamentary Committee at Stafford would have personal information regarding men of both sides whose names are found in the records of the Committee.

Richard Flyer, eldest son of Ralph Flyer, was appointed to the Committee on June 7th, 1643 ; another Uttoxeter member was Richard Pyott, son of Margery Pyott, who was the daughter of Ralph Flyer. Mrs. Pyott also is noteworthy as having bestowed land which she owned at Mansholme for the benefit of "poor men or women who had been at church that morning". The trustees were to provide "twelve twopenny loaves" for distribution. Redfern recorded this gift on p. 120, 2nd Edn. Poor persons of Uttoxeter who were unable to attend church were to be given relief by the trustees. The indenture making this trust is dated 1622.

"Mansholme" is one of a series of field names with "holm" as termination, e.g. "Marriage Holm", "Sweet Holm" ; the Holm was a Scandinavian word meaning an island or flat land by the waterside. It still survives in Stockholm, the capital of Sweden, which was originally founded on land between two stretches of water.

Another local member of the Stafford Committee was Simon Biddulph, whose wife Joyce was a daughter of Richard Flyer.

There is also an entry in the Committee's records regarding John Bayley of Creighton. He had been assessed by the Headborough (an official with certain legal powers in a borough) to pay 4 shillings every three weeks to Parliamentary expenses. It was certified by Mr. Wedgwood (this family had connections with Uttoxeter, Bramshall, and Milwich at that period) that John Bayley could only afford 14d — no reason was given, but the Committee ordered that "John Bayley is to pay no more". This might mean that he was exempt altogether, but it seems more likely that "no more" meant that his assessment was to be 14d every three weeks instead of 4 /-.

Most of the references to Uttoxeter affairs in the reports of the Stafford Committee occur in the years 1643 and 1644. Here it is as well to note the main strategy of the war leading up to this period, for Uttoxeter affairs were affected in an important way. When war broke out in 1642 a number of small local forces were raised by both sides, and there were encounters in most counties on the same scale as the battle of

Hopton Heath, which has already been described. There were also "strong points" such as Tutbury and Dudley Castles, Eccleshall, Lichfield, and even smaller places like Paynsley, Wootton, and Alton. But the main strength of the Royalists was in the West and South West, London, the South-East, East Anglia, and most towns where important industries existed, and where prosperous merchants were found, or where local associations were formed, as in the Eastern Counties.

Charles twice attempted to march to London, but was prevented at Edgehill and Newbury. Some Parliamentary leaders complained that their leaders were not stern enough in fighting the Royalists, and indeed the main aim of Parliament was to defeat the king only to bring about a return of true constitutional government.

But by 1643 in the Uttoxeter district, apart from the Royalist garrison at Tutbury Castle, most strong points in Staffordshire were in Parliamentary hands. The townspeople, however, were in the harsh position of being forced by both sides, as occasion arose, to contribute more than could be reasonably expected. There were numerous occasions when supplies for the Tutbury Castle garrison were sent from Uttoxeter, though the Parliamentary leaders levied regular taxation (as we have seen) on the town. The supply columns for Tutbury Castle were often attacked by Parliament soldiers based on Barton Blount, hence the numerous stories of skirmishes between the two towns — Sir O. Mosley in his *History of Tutbury* (1832) went so far as to say that the "blood of many a brave man" stained the ground by the side of the Dove.

Redfern (pp. 130 *et seq.* 2nd Edn.) quotes from a parliamentary paper printed in 1642 on the occasion of King Charles passing through the town towards the West.

The events of 1643, in addition to those already noted in connection with the Parliamentary Committee of Stafford, and in the early months of 1644, give a rather confusing account. On several occasions the main road, especially those leading Westwards, were barricaded against attack; though from which forces this was expected, it appears more likely that the soldiers and citizens both of the town and neighbouring villages were afraid of Royalist forces from Wales and the West. The year 1644 is notable because the

Earl of Essex made an unsuccessful attempt to subdue the South-Western counties. His army was defeated and surrendered at Lostwithial in Cornwall. This led to another attempt by Charles to capture London, but he was prevented at Newbury. At the same time, Sir Thomas Fairfax was joined by Eastern Counties men under Cromwell at York; an agreement had been made by Parliament with the Scots, who also joined the forces at York. Prince Rupert moved rapidly northwards but was defeated at Marston Moor, and 1644 ended disastrously for the Royalists. The next year found Uttoxeter again under the orders of the king. He had gathered his forces for another march southwards, and with Prince Rupert, came to Uttoxeter from Stone. Other Royalist commanders were Lord Goring (who imprisoned one of the Town Constables, William Fish, for refusing to supply him with provisions), and the Earl of Lichfield.

The inhabitants of the town might well have quoted Shakespeare's words from "Romeo and Juliet" — "a plague on both your houses." The king was this time accommodated at Sir Thomas Milward's house below Eaton Banks, and the accounts show that a Thomas Ball was sent to Eaton from Uttoxeter with a hogshead of beer costing the town £1 - 6 - 8. Even more serious in expense was the taking and keeping of a waggon and horses by the Royal army, and the owners had to be compensated by the parish.

Redfern gives many such details on pp. 158 *et seq.* in his 2nd Edn.; there was bell-ringing to welcome the king, but Uttoxeter must have been glad to see the Royal army depart for Tutbury, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, and Leicester, which was captured by Charles on June 14th, 1645. Apart from other expenses, the constables paid no less than £5 - 12 - 0 for one night's lodging for Prince Rupert and "another prince" (almost certainly Prince Rupert's brother Maurice).

How the Royalist army was able to march through Staffordshire when the Parliament in 1644 had been in control of nearly all the county, is uncertain. It may be that Parliament had withdrawn some troops after the Earl of Essex had been defeated. But after June 1645 the king was met by the Parliament Army, now under Fairfax with Cromwell commanding the Cavalry. Prince Rupert's usual headlong charge beat the men opposed to him, but he returned to the battlefield only to find that Cromwell's Ironsides had

completely conquered the Royal army and Charles had only been saved by retiring with the remnant of his men.

The headlong flight of the Royalists left Charles' baggage and papers in the hands of the victors ; the papers showed that Charles had expected aid from Irishmen, and had gone so far as to agree to all their demands, even promising to establish their religion, in spite of his determined support of the Anglican Church. But Trevelyan remarks (p. 419 of his "History of England") of Charles : "He was by temperament incapable of coming to an honest agreement and abiding by it. The less admirable side of his character taught him to conceive the plan of winning back power by insincere negotiations with both parties. To play with victorious enemies in the hope of deluding them is always dangerous." Moreover, the English hatred of Irish Roman Catholics had been influenced by the massacre of Protestants in 1641, an event seldom noted nowadays.

Charles passed through Lichfield and other West Midland towns, trying to continue a hopeless struggle ; his last band of troops was defeated at Rowton Moor, near Chester, in September 1645, and finally, after rather futile and possibly dissembling negotiations, Charles surrendered to the Scottish forces at Newark in May 1646.

It may be thought that these important national events made little difference to the Uttoxeter district. In fact, there were many instances of local happenings due to the victory of Naseby and subsequent capture of strong points all over England where gallant Royalists had stood firm for the king. Lathom House in Lancashire, which was mentioned on p. 20 of Part III of this history as being the seat of the Stanley family. Tutbury Castle also held out after the Royalist collapse, and the garrison was allowed to go free on honourable terms. Sir W. Brereton, the Parliament commander, agreed at first not to demolish the Castle, but in 1647 it was decided that all such fortresses should be rendered untenable ; local labour was enforced to break down the defences, and the remaining ruins were left in much the same state as at present. The Uttoxeter accounts include payment for labour in lieu of actual demolition. Uttoxeter had endeavoured to keep up the supplies to the castle, as they had done during the siege ;

in fact, when Charles went northward after Naseby, his rearguard had to fight off Parliament troops from Barton Blount, and the king might well have been captured on the road from Tutbury to Ashbourne.

The Uttoxeter Parish accounts for 1645, given with other details by Redfern (on p. 144 2nd Edn.) amounted to the huge sum of £796 /2 /0, most of this being levied by Parliament.

Redfern, on the same page, records an extraordinary occurrence in a country where war had been carried on for several years. In 1647 permission had been given to 46 gipsies to travel in England, and they were allowed by Parliament to obtain relief from the parishes through which they passed. Uttoxeter accounts for this were 4 /-, and the gipsies were also mentioned in the accounts for Checkley Parish.

But the chief event in Uttoxeter after 1646 was the surrender of the Duke of Hamilton's army to General Lambert. The Duke had led a Scottish Army against the Parliament when King Charles had promised the Scots to restore Presbyterianism throughout England. But the Scots were defeated at Preston, Cromwell invaded Scotland, and the remnant of Hamilton's troops after a hopeless march from Lancashire, finally surrendered at Uttoxeter. The Scottish prisoners were billeted in local churches, as indeed so were their guards. Redfern mentions the damage done to Uttoxeter Church but had not discovered that Bramshall Church was similarly misused. We also have an account of the demands made by the Parliament cavalry on Richard Richardson, a farmer whose family continued at Bramshall until the present day. Richard complained on October 2nd 1648 that the Parliamentary cavalry had caused him to lose all the forage which he had stored for the winter. They had consumed all his corn and hay, and (an interesting crop for 1648) all his stock of pease. For this damage he claimed £6, but the record does not state when the Parliament Commander paid the bill.

The year 1648 was noteworthy for the appearance of typical fanatic Parliament supporters in Uttoxeter; this led to serious controversy in Parliamentary affairs throughout England.

In considering the difficulties which faced Parliament when it was clear that the war was won, we have already seen that, apart from the war against the Scots, Uttoxeter showed signs of the general controversy about religious matters. The Scottish invasion which ended at Uttoxeter in 1648 was the result of disappointment and resentment at Parliament's failure to establish Presbyterianism, and the King's promises to the Scots ; this led to similar difficulties with Ireland ; though Uttoxeter was little affected by the prospect (again caused by rather cunning diplomacy of Charles) of wholesale establishment of the Roman Catholic religion in England. Such promises by Charles were clearly impossible to redeem, and Parliament had sent Cromwell to Ireland to put down a rebellion which did not reach England. The fighting can only be described as savage on both sides ; Irish hatred, already shown by a massacre of Protestants in 1641, was more than matched by Cromwell's merciless slaughter of his opponents at Drogheda. We have two Staffordshire examples of this Irish warfare. Alice Stonier, of yeoman class near Leek, lost her husband in Ireland, and the plight of the woman and her two children became known to the Staffordshire Justices of the peace. They ordered the Overseers of the Poor in Leek to pay what now seems a mere pittance of eightpence per week to support the mother and her family.

Another reminder of Irish battles comes in the case of George Jennings of Uttoxeter. He had been with the Parliament forces when the Royalists had been driven from the control of Stafford in 1643, and had continued in the Parliament army up to the Irish campaign of Cromwell in 1649. He served under Capt. William Walker in the regiment of Colonel George Cooke, and was so badly wounded that he was unfit for further service. "His skull had been cut, and a plate of silver had been put in to cover the breach ; one ear was shot through, his cheek slit open, his jawbone broken, his thigh run through in two separate places with broad-headed pikes, his right arm utterly maimed ; his side had been run through, by which accident his belly groweth to it." This gruesome account of what resulted from hand-to-hand fighting is matched by the surprising surgical skill shown by army doctors of the time ; there must have been many other such casualties in the numerous engagements in the Civil War.

We have previously shown how the wider general events of the period could have influence on what went on in Staffordshire and in particular towns and villages. Thus, the Scots defeat and surrender in 1648 not only caused trouble to Uttoxeter people and the surrounding villages, but provided instances of the demand in the ranks of the army for religious freedom, even to the extent of spreading some forms of fanaticism, even at times of hypocrisy.

After King Charles had surrendered in 1647 the army, in arrears of pay and necessary to defend the Parliament so long as Charles continued to foment political strife, stood strongly for religious freedom. In Uttoxeter and its neighbourhood we have already seen that there was an increase in numbers of "sectaries" as they were known. The members of Parliament and the defeated royalist country squires and clergy failed to realise that religious toleration was needed, even if some advocates of this freedom became fanatics. (There were instances of Puritans who had gone with the Pilgrim Fathers to America, returning to the homeland to advocate the proliferation of various sects). But Parliament, even guided at first by men of moderate views, such as Cromwell's son-in-law, General Ireton, stood out for central religious authority, and continued to negotiate with Charles. Ireton, indeed, put before the king constitutional proposals which his friends, even his Queen, begged him to accept. But he still hoped to gain power by setting Parliament, the Army, and even the Scots, to quarrel among themselves. In the end, Cromwell, who risked his own life in suppressing a mutiny of extremists in the army, was forced to admit that the trial and execution of the king was essential. After 30th January 1649, the Parliament continued its ineffectual debates and continual quarreling.

But many of the old Royalists, with the clergy and country squires of the established English church, assisted by Scots who stood by the Stuart family, recognised the king's son as Charles II and again Cromwell had a civil war on his hands. The army of Fairfax and Cromwell had used the superior equipment after Naseby to capture such places as Tutbury Castle ; this train of artillery was still in being when Charles II marched south to attempt the capture of London. Men of Uttoxeter were paid for supplying teams for the transport of this train ; the accounts show for example that Peter Lightfoot in 1651 received £1 - 4 - 0 for helping to convey the "magazine" to Tamworth. But the invaders were defeated and scattered at the battle of Worcester, and what was really

the third Civil War ended with a complete triumph for the government, now wholly controlled by Cromwell. By 1653 a "Convention" prepared the way for a full Parliament in 1654. A notable member of this was Thomas Mynors of Lichfield, of the well-known family of that name.

The story of Cromwell's Protectorate and its influence on this district will form the beginning of Part V of this work.

Distributed by H. M. Bowring, Market Place, Uttoxeter.

Published by W. G. Torrance, Uttoxeter.